



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/767,676	01/29/2004	Gerhard Benning	2001P15983WOUS	5989
7590 SIEMENS CORPORATION INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPT. 170 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH ISELIN, NJ 08830		02/06/2008	EXAMINER BRANDT, CHRISTOPHER M	
			ART UNIT 2617	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/06/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/767,676	BENNING ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Christopher M. Brandt	2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 November 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 1/29/2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This Action is in response to applicant's amendment filed on November 15, 2007.

Claims 1-17 are still pending in the present application. **This Action is made FINAL.**

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-8, 12-17 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lindgren et al. (US Patent 6,411,632 B2, hereinafter Lindgren)** in view of **Moore, Jr. et al. (US Patent 7,035,270 B2, hereinafter Moore)** and further in view of **McKeeth (US Patent 7,188,175 B1)**.

Consider **claim 1**. Lindgren discloses an arrangement for a wireless connection of terminal devices to a communication system (abstract), comprising:

a data packet network for the transmission of data packets using network addresses valid within the network (column 4 lines 10-25, 38-41, read as TCP/IP network with the network hub, which includes an IP address for communications using the TCP/IP protocol);

at least one transition device coupled to the data packet network, to which at least one mobile device that is serviced by the transition device is coupled, the transition device having a coupling table with terminal device addresses of terminal devices located within the radio range of at least one mobile device (column 4 lines 42-45, read as the network hub further includes a translation table for storing the mobile identification numbers (MIN) of mobile stations being serviced by a wireless office interconnected with the network hub);

a server coupled to the data packet network for controlling connections to the terminal devices, the server having an allocation table (column 4 lines 38-41, 47-52, read as the network, hub includes an IP address for communications using the TCP/IP protocol and a signal point code (address) for communications with respect to the SS7 protocol. There is also a translation table that enables the location of mobile stations according to the IP address of its serving wireless office and a network table addressing table, includes a listing of all nodes and signaling point codes (addresses) within the public access network); and

a packet-based alignment protocol for the dynamic alignment of the allocation table with the coupling table (column 4 lines 34-38, 45-47, read as the conversion between transportation of the IS-41 messages by the SS7 protocol or the TCP/IP protocol is performed by processing means within the network hub and enables interconnection of the public network to the wireless offices. It is also discloses that associated with the stored MIN are the IP address of the wireless office in which a mobile station is registered).

Lindgren substantially discloses the claimed invention except he fails to disclose a short-range radio module (Lindgren discloses a mobile station that is coupled to a wireless office, which in turn is coupled to network hub).

However, Moore discloses a short-range radio module (column 8 lines 30-59, read as the home networking gateway can use this SDP protocol to discover devices with telephony services capabilities).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teachings of Moore into the invention of Lindgren in order to more easily coordinate a home or office network (column 8 lines 30-59).

In addition, Lindgren and Moore fail to explicitly teach comprising for each transition device: an aligned copy of the coupling table and a network address for the respective transition device such that the address is associated with the copied table and wherein via the alignment protocol the coupling table is transmitted to the server to dynamically update the allocation table thereby aligning the copy of the coupling table in the allocation table.

However, McKeeth discloses comprising for each transition device: an aligned copy of the coupling table and a network address for the respective transition device such that the address is associated with the copied table and wherein via the alignment protocol the coupling table is transmitted to the server to dynamically update the allocation table thereby aligning the copy of the coupling table in the allocation table (column 5 lines 39-50, read as to maintain a current list of IP addresses, the server 230 periodically establishes a link with one or more other DNS servers to acquire a copy of an up-to-date list of IP addresses or to check that an existing list has not changed).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teachings of McKeeth into the invention of Lindgren and Moore in order to ensure that the server has an up-to-date list of IP addresses as topology of the Internet changes (column 5 lines 39-50).

Consider **claim 2 and as applied to claim 1**. Lindgren, Moore, and McKeeth disclose wherein the data packet network is realized by a network based on an Internet protocol (column 2 lines 15-19).

Consider **claim 3 and as applied to claim 1**. Lindgren, Moore, and McKeeth disclose wherein the transition device comprises a translator for translation between a network protocol

used in the data packet network and a protocol specific to a radio module (Lindgren; column 5 lines 45-51).

Consider **claim 4 and as applied to claim 3**. Lindgren, Moore, and McKeeth disclose wherein the translator comprises a detection device for detecting, by means of the network protocol used, which terminal device-specific application a connection to a terminal device is allocated to, in order to be able to perform an application-specific protocol conversion accordingly (column 4 lines 42-56).

Consider **claim 5 and as applied to claim 3**. Lindgren, Moore, and McKeeth disclose wherein the protocol specific to a radio module having a specific voice interface and a specific data interface (Lindgren; column 3 lines 22-34).

Consider **claim 6 and as applied to claim 1**. Lindgren, Moore, and McKeeth disclose wherein a module based on an IEEE 802.15.1 is used as a short-range radio module (Moore; column 8 lines 30-59).

Consider **claim 7 and as applied to claim 1**. Lindgren, Moore, and McKeeth disclose wherein a locating device uses the allocation table for determining a momentary location of a particular terminal (Lindgren; column 4 lines 42-56).

Consider **claim 8 and as applied to claim 1**. Lindgren, Moore, and McKeeth disclose wherein a gateway device is coupled to the data packet network for coupling the data packet to a forwarding communication network (Lindgren; column 2 lines 20-30).

Consider **claim 12 and as applied to claim 2**. Lindgren, Moore, and McKeeth disclose the transition device comprises a translator for translation between a network protocol used in the data packet network and a protocol specific to a radio module (Lindgren; column 4 lines 42-56).

Consider **claim 13 and as applied to claim 4**. Lindgren, Moore, and McKeeth disclose wherein the protocol specific to a radio module having a specific voice interface and a specific data interface (Lindgren; column 3 lines 22-34).

Consider **claim 14 and as applied to claim 2**. Lindgren, Moore, and McKeeth disclose a module based on an IEEE 802.15.1 standard is used as a short-range radio module (Moore; column 8 lines 30-59).

Consider **claim 15 and as applied to claim 3**. Lindgren, Moore, and McKeeth disclose a module based on an IEEE 802.15.1 standard is used as a short-range radio module (Moore; column 8 lines 30-59).

Consider **claim 16 and as applied to claim 2**. Lindgren, Moore, and McKeeth disclose a locating device uses the allocation table for determining a momentary location of a particular terminal (Lindgren; column 4 lines 42-56).

Consider **claim 17 and as applied to claim 2**. Lindgren, Moore, and McKeeth disclose a gateway device is coupled to the data packet network for coupling the data packet network to a forwarding communication network (Lindgren; column 2 lines 20-30).

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lindgren et al. (US Patent 6,411,632 B2)** in view of **Moore, Jr. et al. (US Patent 7,035,270 B2)** in view of **McKeeth (US Patent 7,188,175 B1)** and further in view of **Rautiola et al. (US Patent 6,853,851 B1, hereinafter Rautiola)**.

Consider **claim 9 and as applied to claim 1**. Lindgren, Moore, and McKeeth disclose the claimed invention but fail to disclose a headset as a terminal device for voice connection.

However, Rautiola discloses a headset as a terminal device for voice connection (column 12 line 61 – column 13 line 13).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teachings of Rautiola into the invention of Lindgren, Moore, and McKeeth in order to allow a user to use a lightweight terminal (column 3 lines 51-59).

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lindgren et al. (US Patent 6,411,632 B2)** in view of **Moore, Jr. et al. (US Patent 7,035,270 B2)** in view of **McKeeth (US Patent 7,188,175 B1)** and further in view of **Bishop et al. (US Patent 6,850,512 B1, hereinafter Bishop)**.

Consider **claim 10 and as applied to claim 1**. Lindgren, Moore, and McKeeth disclose the claimed invention but fail to disclose a PDA (Personal Digital Assistant) as a terminal device for data connections.

However, Bishop discloses a PDA (Personal Digital Assistant) as a terminal device for data connections (column 4 lines 10-26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teachings of Bishop into the invention of Lindgren, Moore, and McKeeth in order to give the user the flexibility of a portable or laptop computer (column 4 lines 10-26).

Consider **claim 11 and as applied to claim 1**. Lindgren, Moore, and McKeeth disclose the claimed invention but fail to disclose a PDA (Personal Digital Assistant) as a terminal device for entering destination addresses for outgoing connections and for initiating those connections.

However, Bishop discloses a PDA (Personal Digital Assistant) as a terminal device for entering destination addresses for outgoing connections and for initiating those connections (column 4 lines 10-26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teachings of Bishop into the invention of Lindgren, Moore, and McKeeth in order to be able to convert to a format suitable for transmission so that information can be transmitted (column 4 lines 10-26)

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street

Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher M. Brandt whose telephone number is (571) 270-1098. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30a.m. to 5p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nick Corsaro can be reached on (571) 272-7876. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number:
10/767,676
Art Unit: 2617

Page 11

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.



Christopher M. Brandt

C.M.B./cmb

February 4, 2008



JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER